

REMARKS

We have amended claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13-14, 23, 26, 39-41, 45-48 to clarify the subject matter. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, we request withdrawal of each of the rejections and allowance of the application.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112

We have amended claims 4, 10, 13, 23, 26, 41, 46 and 47 to remove the word "types."

The Examiner objected to the use of the word CMAS "engine" in claims 13 and 26.

We submit that the specification provides a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would be reasonably appraised of the scope of these claims. For example, the CMAS engine 222, in one embodiment, can be a computer configured as a server such as CMAS server 204 shown in FIG. 6A. FIG. 6B shows a business system that provides an interface to a CMAS engine 222. The CMAS engine 222 can communicate with channel product interfaces 250, databases 240 and enterprise interfaces 224. (See page 15, line 30 to page 16, line 19)

In view of applicants' amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 101

Claims 1, 13 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 13 and 39 have been amended to recite a "computerized" method. As a result, amended claims 1, 13 and 39 recite the use of technology to more particularly direct the claimed invention to statutory subject matter.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC § 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-16, 21-29, 34-43 and 45-49 as anticipated by "Oraclemobile.com spin-off to focus on wireless"; CNET News.com; February 22, 2000' Stephanie Miles (hereafter referred to as the Oracle publication).

We submit, however, that the Oracle publication neither describes nor suggests storing a customer contact hierarchy list "including ranked customer contact information" and contacting the customer according to the customer contact hierarchy "including ranked customer contact information" when at least one of the selected businesses has an alert for the customer as recited in amended claim 1.

Rather, the Oracle publication describes a service that provides preset service and customized alerts. (See page 3, paragraph 10). The preset service allows frequently used information to be stored and retrieved. Customized alerts allow a user to receive a message whenever the status of the service changes. (See page 4, paragraph 1) The Oracle publication describes how to set up the customized alerts and preset services. (See Page 3, paragraph 3 and page 4 paragraphs 7-9 of the Oracle publication). The Oracle publication mentions that a user can edit alerts and services that a user device can receive. In other words, the Oracle publication describes flat or non-hierarchical data structure, which is not a "hierarchy list of ranked contact information", as required by amended claim 1. For this reason alone, we submit that claim 1 is patentable over the Oracle publication. We further submit that because claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, these dependent claim are patentable for at least the same reason that independent claim 1 is patentable..

Likewise, we submit that the Oracle publication does not disclose an article that includes instructions to cause a computer to store a customer contact hierarchy list "including ranked customer contact information" and contact the customer according to the customer contact hierarchy "including ranked customer contact information ..." as recited in amended claim 7. Thus, independent claim 7 is allowable over the Oracle publication and dependent claims 8-11 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable.

Similarly, we submit that the Oracle publication does not disclose a computerized method that includes permitting the customer to specify a contact hierarchy list "including ranked

customer contact information” and alerting the customer by attempting to contact the customer according to that customer’s hierarchy list “of ranked customer contact information,” as recited in amended claim 13. Thus, independent claim 13 is allowable over the Oracle publication and dependent claims 14-16 and 21-25 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 13 is allowable.

In a similar manner, we submit that the Oracle publication does not describe or suggest an article that includes instructions to permit the customer to specify a contact hierarchy list “including ranked customer contact information” and alert the customer according to that customer’s hierarchy list “including ranked customer contact information,” As recited in amended claim 26. Thus independent claim 26 is allowable over the Oracle publication and dependent claims 27-29 and 34-38 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 26 is allowable.

Likewise, we submit that the Oracle publication does not describe or suggest a computerized method that includes “alerting a customer of the alert messages according to a customer’s hierarchy list including ranked customer contact information,” as recited in amended claim 39. Thus, independent claim 39 is allowable over the Oracle publication and dependent claims 40-43 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 39 is allowable.

Similarly, we submit that the Oracle publication does not describe or suggest an article that includes instructions to cause a computer to “alert a customer of the alert messages according to a customer’s hierarchy list including ranked customer contact information,” as recited in amended claim 45. Thus, independent claim 45 is allowable over the Oracle publication and dependent claims 46-49 should be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 45 is allowable.

Consequently, we request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of the claims.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 12, 17-20, 30-33, 44 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Oracle publication in view of the “Covergys to market Neuromedia’s web sales and support software”; Telecomworld’ Conventry; April 18, 2000 (hereafter referred to as the Convergys publication).

Applicant : Hayes et al.
Serial No. : 09/876,563
Filed : June 7, 2001
Page : 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 12587-007001

We submit however that the Convergys publication adds nothing to those features found to be lacking by the Oracle publication. That is, the Convergys publication neither describes nor suggests storing a customer contact hierarchy list “including ranked customer contact information” and contacting or alerting the customer according to the customer contact hierarchy “including ranked customer contact information” when at least one of the selected businesses has an alert for the customer. Thus, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons explained above.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.